

Appn No. 10/066,982
Amdt date June 29, 2005
Reply to Office action of April 6, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office action mailed April 6, 2005, claims 1-61 were pending in the application. Claims 1-8, 9-10 (see Detailed Action, p. 6), 17, 19, 21-24, 29-31, 33, 42-46, 48, and 55 were rejected. These claims are now cancelled.

Claims 11-16, 18, 20, 25-28, 34-41, 47, 49-54, 56-61 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In addition, claim 1 was objected to because of informalities relating to awkward language.

The Examiner is thanked for attention to the application.

As previously stated, the rejected claims have been cancelled.

Of the objected claims, claims 11, 18, 20, 25, 34, 47, and 49 have been rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of their respective base claim and any intervening claims, if any.

The remaining claims are dependent on one of these claims. In this regard, claim 56 has been rewritten to depend on claim 49 (as opposed to depending on now cancelled claim 55, which depended on now cancelled independent claim 33), and to additionally include any limitations from prior claim 55. In addition, commas have been inserted in the text that was previously found in claim 1, and now found in claims 11, 18, and 20 as suggested by the Office action.

**Appln No. 10/066,982
Amdt date June 29, 2005
Reply to Office action of April 6, 2005**

Accordingly, all the claims are in condition for allowance,
and allowance of same is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By


Daniel M. Cavanagh

Reg. No. 41,661
626/795-9900

DMC/rmw
RMW IRV1087505.1--06/28/05 6:42 PM